What Cuba Said At Punta del Este, Pps. 2-3

Pro-Testing Crowd Gunning for Dr. Bethe: Scientists Protested McCone Nomination, Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. X, NO. 6 FEBRUARY 12, 1962 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

An Arms Budget Designed to Terrify

In terms of size, shape and military doctrine, the new Kennedy arms budget is a terrifying document, and intended to terrify. In terms of size, it is roughly $10 billion higher than Eisenhower's. During his Administration the arms budget was somewhat higher than $40 billions. Under Kennedy it emerges somewhat higher than $50 billions. A decade ago, just before the Korean war, it was barely past $10 billions. In terms of shape, the arms budget resembles that advocated some years ago in the Rockefeller Brothers report on military policy, i.e. the armed services are being recast and merged functionally, with separate commands and striking forces for thermonuclear war, for continental defense, and for limited "police" actions on the periphery of the Soviet bloc to stop up any fissures in the wall of containment. In terms of military doctrine, the budget embodies a more adventurous policy than Eisenhower's. Where Eisenhower said war was now "preposterous," Kennedy is prepared to play the terrible game in three forms.

More for Chemical and Germ War

The one that seems to fascinate him most is that of para-military operations: the use of secret small detachments for undeclared war. Three new centers for such "special forces" are to be added to the two already in existence at Fort Bragg, N.C. and Fort Gulick in the Panama Canal Zone. Of the three, one is to be for trans Pacific operations, another for Europe and the third for the Middle East. The second form in which Kennedy is ready to play the war game is that of limited conflict, conventional or with so-called tactical nuclear arms. In both para-military and limited war, a larger role for chemical and biological weapons is foreshadowed by the new budget; the Army's spending plans for these is up 67% to $85 millions. For so-called limited war purposes, the new budget adds two divisions to the Regular Army and provides the Army with improved conventional weapons; the Navy, with more ships; the Air Force, with four more wings of tactical aircraft.

The third form in which Kennedy is prepared to play the game of war is that of all-out thermonuclear conflict. The new budget represents the defeat of those who advocate the establishment of a stabilized nuclear deterrent of some 200 "invulnerable" Polaris and solid fuel Minuteman missiles under whose protective umbrella disarmament might be negotiated. The budget programs an enormous force of some 1600 missiles although it is now recognized that there is no "missile gap", that even in ICBM's we are ahead of the Russians. The missile program mounts staggeringly, as if earlier fantasies about the Russians having 500 ICBM's (when apparently they have only about 50) were realities. Plans for so huge a force must make the Russians feel that we are moving from the idea of a deterrent to the preparation of a possible attack. The pyromaniacs are jubilant; Joseph Alsop in recent columns has been hinting joyfully that we have at last abandoned Eisenhower's "never strike first" doctrine.

This may overstate the intention but not the drift of policy. The truth is that the path of least resistance is mass production of missiles, and the only doctrine that can justify this is one which holds that "under great provocation" we must be ready to strike first and have a missile force so huge it can wipe out even hardened bases on the other side, win the war and survive. The corollary of this is a shelter program, private or communal, to make this "credible" not only to the Russians but to ourselves. The shelter program has become another facet of the familiar Democratic armament policy begun under Truman; another way to prime the pump of business and at the same time support a "tougher" foreign policy.* With this is revived the Acheson notion that if we build up overwhelming power we can dictate terms, particularly if we make it clear that we are ready—if need be—to risk war to enforce them. This, my friends, is not a peace race.

Economic Impact of Disarmament

When John J. McCloy was adviser to the President on disarmament, he named a panel under Emile Benoit of Columbia to study its economic impact. What began in a burst of zeal seems to have ended in a damp little squib. The panel submitted its report last October but has just been released now by Wm. C. Foster, director of the new U.S. Arms and Disarmament Agency, probably the capital's most timorous executive. It reads as if prepared or revised under instructions not to alarm the Pentagon. It begins, incredibly, with this sentence, "Threats to national security now require an improvement in U.S. military capabilities," not the most evangelical start for a study of disarmament and difficult to reconcile with Secretary McNamara's boast the same day that the U.S. armed forces were strong enough to ride out any currently possible nuclear attack and "completely destroy" the attacker. The report's "Model of General and Complete Disarmament" envisages a gradual reduction over the next 15 years to 10 billions in arms spending and 500,000 men in the armed forces! Just how this constitutes "complete and general" disarming is not explained. The report, which we may discuss in more detail later, finds as expected that the economic problem this would create is not insoluble, but its meager and cautious analysis is neither inspired nor inspiring. The manner and timing of its release reflects an official atmosphere less than passionate about the whole subject.

*** See the National Planning Association's January bulletin which says the shelter program would take up the slack in steel and cement while making a first strike strategy "credible."**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Cuba Had to Say in Its Own Defense at the Punta del Este Conference...

We are sorry to see Cuba go the way of Marxism Leninism just when revelations about Stalin show how inevitably a one-party state without a free press breeds injustice and degenerates into bureaucratic authoritarianism and thought control. But U.S. behavior toward Cuba hardly constitutes an advertisement for the ideals of Jefferson. It was very hard to tell from the news dispatches in our own free press what Cuba had said at Punta del Este. In the interest of fairness, we present on these two inside pages excerpts from the speech made by President Dorticos of Cuba at Punta del Este on Jan. 25.

We believe Punta del Este marks another step down a disastrous road. It splits the hemisphere; on one side are mostly the petty dictatorships of the Caribbean area. On the other side are the major republics with a majority of Latin America's land and peoples, more fearful of U.S. interventionism than of Castroism. Within these countries, the military and the rightists, as in Argentina, are using the Cuban issue to regain power at the expense of precarious democratic institutions. The effect will be to polarize the struggle, and to weaken those moderate elements which are the only support of the Alliance for Progress. Finally we believe the conference will strengthen rightist elements at home. Their appetite for stronger measures against Cuba has been whetted. Kennedy's fixation about Cuba led to his first great setback last April. We believe worse are ahead. How can we campaign for world law when we violate the law of the hemisphere by economic and military aggression against Cuba?—IFS

From the Dorticos Speech

"This meeting [Pres. Dorticos said] was promoted to prepare a favorable climate in the Hemisphere for a new physical and military aggression against my country and as such I denounce it. . . .

"But as we shall see later, this meeting also has another aim. This is not only a meeting against Cuba, it is not only a meeting against the Cuban people. At this meeting there are some who also conspire against the inevitable future freedom of many Latin American peoples. They wish to take the practical measures and precautions deemed necessary not, as they so often repeat, to prevent the propagation of international communism in this hemisphere, but simply to put a stop to national liberation or anti-imperialist movements among many peoples of Latin America. . . .

"In the future, strikes will be suppressed more violently; bloodshed and bullets will be used to try to destroy farm workers' movements; and, perhaps, the power of circumstances themselves may, some dramatic day, make this continent the scene of another colonial war. On the one hand will stand the peoples, longing for freedom, determinedly rising in rebellion; on the other will stand fierce imperialism, seeking with marines, transported armies, and specially trained groups, to put down the efforts of the peoples. . . .

"Thus are we attacked and injured by those who invoke the sanctity of human rights. Why were these champions of human rights in our hemisphere not stirred or even moved by the report that a field worker in our literacy campaign, a 16-year old worker, was murdered by a gang of counter-revolutionaries equipped by the U.S. intelligence service? . . . But the OAS took no note; the Ministers of Foreign Affairs, some of them listening to me now, took no note. . . .

"We are also charged with violating the exercise of democracy. . . . Speak of representative democracy to the American Indian, to the U.S. Negro, to the illiterates of this hemisphere, to the poor and the hungry. Gentlemen, once illiteracy has disappeared from your countries, once there is no poverty, no discrimination—then is the time to speak of democracy. . . . Democracy. Does it by any chance exist in Paraguay? Are you about to demand that I prove that there is no democracy in Paraguay? Democracy in Nicaragua. Are you going to ask me to prove the lack of it in the face of notorious fact? . . .

"And furthermore, gentlemen, with all these old evils, are periodic elections the only way that the people have to express their will? Would you try to ignore history? Are you trying to disregard the scientific truth of history? Do you seek to ignore the fact that history has been spurred on by revolutions, that revolutions are the exceptional, glorious and culminating experiences of the people, the real expression of their will?

"Obviously, all revolutions and among them the Cuban revolution, work toward creating institutions, including an electoral system. Cuba is not an exception to the rule. Our

If the Pope Can Co-Exist With Castro

It is easy to imagine the outcry from the Senate Internal Security Committee and the House Un-American Activities Committee if leading Protestant clergymen were now to give a friendly reception to an emissary from Castro, as the Pope did on February 3 when he accepted the credentials of a new Cuban Ambassador to the Vatican and accorded him a private audience. The new envoy, to top it all, is (according to the UPI from Vatican City) "a leftwing intellectual who fought on the Loyalist side in Spain." If a Senate committee can investigate the United Nations, as Internal Security did a few years ago under that devout son of the Church and friend of Franco, McCarran—why not the Papacy? If it can pillory the Protestant clergy for not being soft on Communism, why not the Pope for being soft on Castroism? Alternatively, if the Pope can co-exist with Castro, why can't we?

U. S. Charged With Enmity to Cuban Revolution Even Before It Turned Socialist

"I wish to reply here to the statements made by the Secretary of State of the United States. He said that the North American government had no quarrel, originally, with the Cuban revolution; the fact that our Revolution became a Socialist revolution, that we declared its basis to be the Marxist-Leninist ideology, which we make no attempt to hide, is what has provoked that country's enmity. What a short memory!

"Have they forgotten that they began to send insolent diplomatic notes in early 1959 because we had merely proposed an agrarian reform? Have they forgotten that before we nationalized one North American monopoly they began to cut our sugar quota? Have they forgotten that before we adopted any socialistic measures or even any nationalizing measures in our country, in 1959, many planes coming from North American territory set fire to our sugar fields and harvests and burned many of our farmers' homes?

"This enmity on the part of the Government of the United States is not only against the socialistic revolution. We are not claiming or aspiring or trying to export our socialism to any American country. But that won't matter; if any other country of America makes a nationalistic liberation attempt that includes true agrarian reform, nationalization of North American companies and intervention of North American utility companies, it will be enough to cause in those countries a repetition of the events of which we were victims since early 1959, even before our revolution became socialistic."

—President Dorticos of Cuba addressing the Punta del Este Conference Jan. 25.

We'll Send A Free Sample Copy of This Issue —

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . From the Speech By President Dorticos Blacked Out in the U. S. Press

revolution is directed toward the creation of institutions, which will give definitive form to our great socio-economic changes. Cuba will adopt institutions, among them, the electoral institution. But Cuba will do this in the way and at the time our people so determine, and not in response to any international coercion or intimidation by force. Cuba has lived for three years as an expression of popular will. . . .

"Furthermore, if these are governments of the people, by the people and for the people, I would invite them to arm their people as Cuba has . . . then we would see how short a time they would stay in power. . . .

"The government of the United States asks for freedom and democracy. Let us remember, at least, what the great Simon Bolivar said: 'The United States seems destined by providence to plague America with woes in the name of freedom' . . .

What Cuba Has Achieved

"What have we done, what has the Cuban Revolution done that it is now to be condemned? What has it done in spite of these aggressions, sabotage and espionage infiltrations? In agriculture, over 140,000 field workers have become landowners. There are 125,000 sugar workers working in the cane cooperatives . . . we have done away with chronic seasonal unemployment in our agriculture. In the people's farms, 120,000 agricultural workers have employment assured. Unemployment has virtually vanished from our lands and, at times, we face manpower shortages. . . . The industrial growth of Cuba, for the first 3 years of the Revolution, is more than 50 percent. . . .

"In the national budget of Cuba for 1962, the expenses for education, science and culture amount to 270 million pesos, almost four times as much as the highest amount ever paid in our country. . . . The budget of the Public Health Department in 1958 amounted to 21 million pesos; in 1962 it is 89 millions. Our rate of economic growth will not be lower than a cumulative 12 percent. . . . This in itself is unheard of in the economic development of Latin America.

"As to literacy . . . only 3 percent of the Cuban population is still illiterate, and this includes senile persons whom it is impossible to teach and persons with physical and mental defects. . . . Could it be for this that they want to condemn us?

"Cuba is simply an idea and an example. If this idea and this example constitute a danger to imperialism, a danger to oligarchy, a danger to the exploiters, it is not the fault of this idea and of this example, but that of imperialism, oligarchy and exploiters. . . .

"Cuba is the first country of America to begin the road to socialism: but, as history shows, it need not be the last. If an international juridical community is to endure, whether it be a world-wide one or a regional one, it must be based on the compulsory acceptance of this diversity of political and social systems. If mutual respect exists, if the right of each state to determine its own destiny is recognized; if states refrain from all forms of intervention in the affairs of the rest, then differences in systems can be no obstacle to coexistence in regional organisms.

"Cuba will not permit the socialist nature of its revolution to be used as a pretext to limit its rights as a sovereign state in a regional organization. Either the OAS, as such a regional organization functioning within our geographic limits, has room for all the American nations, whatever may be their social or political systems, or the OAS becomes the shameless, unabashed private preserve of Washington, ruled in the manner of a Ministry of Colonies."

Why Cuba Turned to Soviet Trade

"We are also accused of maintaining relations with the socialist countries and, especially, of the fact that our economic and commercial relations are now virtually monopolized by imports from and exports to the socialist countries, and this is affirmed to be a sin or a crime. However, the reason why this has happened is forgotten.

"Before our successful revolution, our country, essentially an exporter of a single commodity, used to deal almost exclusively with the U.S. When the Revolution triumphed, the Revolutionary Government of Cuba set for itself, among other goals for economic transformation, the task of overcoming our status as exporters of a single commodity and the diversification of our foreign trade.

"Did we want, then, or do we want now, to limit our trade to a single group of countries? On the contrary, we would have wanted—and did want, to increase in a rational way our economic relations with the U.S. But it was the U.S. which, by a unilateral decision and as a measure of economic aggression, limited and curtailed our economic relations, cancelled its purchases of our products to ruin our people and defeat the Revolution. What did it want, then? To have hunger prevail in our land?"

—Cuba's President Dorticos at Punta del Este Jan. 25.

CIA Accused of Sending Batista Captain to Assassinate Fidel and Raul Castro

"It is not we who are disturbing the peace of America. . . . Have we by any chance signed a military pact with anyone, as the U.S. has signed military pacts of aggression, thereby bringing the cold war to our hemisphere and jeopardizing the peace of its peoples? Is not the peace of our Hemisphere disturbed when the U.S. fleet is mobilized to force events in the Republic of Santo Domingo? Is not the peace of the Hemisphere disturbed when our country is invaded? Is not the peace of the Hemisphere disturbed when atomic bases are established in Purto Rico? Is it not a breach of the peace to maintain, by force, a U.S. naval base in Cuba? Is it not a breach of the peace in the Hemisphere when the government of the U.S. organizes, as it is doing, training bases now in operation for aggression against Cuba, not only in the U.S. but in other countries of Latin America? . . . Is not the peace of America disturbed when agents of the U.S. Intelligence Service infiltrate our country? . . .

"Is not the peace of the continent disturbed when, on November 19, 1961, a group of seven persons led by a former captain of Batista's army, landed at Punta de Coco and it was found, after seizure of the arms and documents and from their statements, that they had been trained in espionage techniques by the government of the U.S. for the purpose, among others, of carrying out a so-called 'Operation Patty', consisting of nothing less than the death or assassination of Commanders Fidel and Raul Castro? From them were taken two cannon, four bazookas, 23 rifles, etc., all of them arms of the U.S. Army. . . .

"I wish to remind you that it was President Kennedy himself who declared a few days before the invasion, that the government of the U.S. would never take part in it, only to declare some days later that he assumed the responsibility for the invasion. . . . Why did not the OAS go into action then? . . . Does the U.S., within the strict and rigorous regulations of the OAS, have exceptional permission to invade a country without anything happening?"

—Cuba's President Dorticos at Punta del Este Jan. 25.

To Friends If You Send Long Stamped Self-Addressed Envelopes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pro-Testing Crowd Gunning for Dr. Bethe; Scientists Protested to White House Against McCone

AEC Quickly Identifies New Russian Underground Test

New developments in the controversy over nuclear testing during the past week:

1. On Feb. 2 the Russians set off an underground explosion in central Asia in the region of Semipalatinsk. The AEC in Washington that afternoon announced the explosion, saying it "was well above the threshold of underground detectability by a single national system." "For background only, not for attribution" the size of the Soviet explosion was placed at from 20 to 100 kilotons. But the next day the Seismological Institute in Uppsala, Sweden, one of the world's best, said the explosion was only 10 kilotons. The AEC declined to comment on or explain the difference and few newspapers published the AP dispatch from Uppsala. We saw it only in the *Washington Evening Star,* Feb. 3. This was one more indication that long distance identification of underground shots is easier than we have been told.

That Lead Jacket

2. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy is gunning for Dr. Hans Bethe and executive hearings were to be held February 7 and 8 to investigate whether he violated security by his talk at Cornell Jan. 5 (which we reported in our issue of Jan. 15). Dr. Bethe irked the pro-testing crowd by revealing that the relative cleanliness of the big Russian bomb explosion of Oct. 30 was due to its being encased in a lead jacket and not (as fed out by Dr. Teller to *Time Magazine* and the *New York Times*) to any new triggering device which supposedly brought the Soviets nearer to that "clean" neutron bomb.

3. In a long piece on the McCone and testing controversy in the *New York Times* Feb. 4 its military expert, Hanson W. Baldwin, disclosed that Dr. George T. Kistiakowsky of Harvard, former science adviser to President Eisenhower "headed a group to the White House that opposed Mr. McCone's appointment as CIA director. According to Mr. Baldwin, this reflected the feeling of "many in the academic and scientific community" who "regard Mr. McCone as biased and 'injudicious'" in his advocacy of resumed nuclear testing. Mr. Baldwin also disclosed that after the committee of scientists headed by Dr. Bethe made the report the White House had requested of them on the results of Soviet testing, Mr. McCone presented another evaluation which "apparently viewed the Soviet progress in considerably stronger terms than did the earlier scientific analysis." Who said Mr. McCone would take no hand in policy formation?* And what has happened to the atmosphere of free debate when scientists are afraid to oppose a CIA appointment publicly?

Total letters to the President in our anti-testing campaign as of Feb. 7 was 1937, keep them coming.

AEC Now Dubious of Underground Testing

"Underground testing is limited to the lower yield devices (up to some tens of kilotons at present) and certain types of tests, particularly some effects tests [presumably the effects of the weapons on military targets—IFS], cannot be made in this way at all. Hence, steps were taken to prepare for a series of tests in the atmosphere in the event the President should decide to expand the test effort in this way.

"While important development information with respect to nuclear weapons designs was discovered in the course of the underground tests, these tests also revealed that testing underground is a slower and more expensive process than had previously been assumed. It has proved to be more difficult to diagnose some of the results of development tests; operational difficulties such as post-shot re-entry and re-use of partially contaminated tunnels were continuing factors in delaying the test program."

AEC Annual Report for 1961, released Jan. 30.

*** With respectful salute we record the 12 Senators who voted against, and the three who were paired against, the McCone confirmation: Burdick (D. N.Dak.), Byrd (D. W.Va.), Case (R. S. Dak.), Fulbright (D. Ark.), Gruening (D. Alaska), Lausche (D. Ohio), McCarthy (D. Minn.), Metcalf (D. Mont.), Neuberger (D. Ore.), Proxmire (D. Wis.), Smith (R. Me.) and Young (D. Ohio). Morse (D. Ore.), Douglas (D. Ill.) and Clark (D. Pa.) were paired against the nomination. We would also pay tribute to Drew Pearson whose columns did so much to awaken the Senate and the public to the issue.**

1961 Index Ready—Free But You Must Send Stamped Self-Addressed Long Envelope For It

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

2/12/62

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Weekly, Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every Monday except the last Monday in August and the first in September and the last Monday in December and the first in January at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED